But my space is gone – and I must abruptly close. Pray let me hear from you whenever you can. The Inquirer of June 21. I have not rec'd. Probably they have it, in Boston, and Mr. G. kept it, to use, as I should wish him to do. – I shall look out for the more correct report of your ~~London meeting~~ which you promise to get out. The Lord's friends will try their experiment, I hope. My best regards to your daughter, and to all Bristol friends. – Please assure the Crafts of our continued & deep interest in them; and Mr. W. Brown the same. Most truly Yours, Saml. May Jr.

Manchester — Greetings; Institutions prepared

Leicester, (Massts.) July 13. 1851.

My dear Mr. Estlin,

The successive letters of yourself and daughter have interested me (and others) very deeply, and I have felt very much obliged to you both, that, in the very midst of your cares and busiest labours, you would find, or make, time to keep us notified of what was going on with you. I have sympathized with you in your struggles – sorrowed with you in your defeats and rejoiced in your great success. The firm stand taken by the Lewin's Mead Meeting was an excellent thing – it seemed the 'best bower anchor' which held fast, while all (or nearly all) of the rest of the Unitarian body ~~[illegible]~~ seemed fast drifting to leeward. Nearly all, was properly put in; for the resolutions of the Warrington Congregation were timely and good; so were those of the Bury and Exeter Congregations, which came after. How you must have been tried and afflicted by the behaviour of the Western Union! And even more (though perhaps better prepared for it) by the course of the London Committee. The Bristol people have stood their ground well – fought manfully – and deserved the triumph which they certainly won. Your London meeting was capital, – glorious. I cannot but wonder that, with the apathy & hostility of the Unitarian majority on one side, & the bigotry and scandalous meanness of the Exeter Hall people on the other, you did not give up in despair. How fortunate that you did not. The hope and courage which held you up, and carried you forward, enabled you *to reap the harvest*, for which you had been working so long and so hard, and without which you would perhaps have wholly lost it – at least, so far as the Unitarian body goes. I hope that Mrs Chapman or Miss Weston will send, to the Stand. or Libr., a letter giving their impressions of the meeting. – The recent action of your different religious bodies has been very opportune, and cannot fail to have its effect for the right. The most of our *religious* journals suppress all knowledge of this action; but still, in many other ways, it gets before the people here – more or less of it –, and will continue working its way along, until it becomes universally known. – And would to God, that there might be ground & reason for its being known, all over the land, that every religious body and association, and every pulpit, in Great Britain & Ireland, ~~would~~ had distinctly refused to be, directly or ~~in~~ indirectly, accessory to the crime of the American Churches, in being "the chief bulwarks of American Slavery". Accessory they are, in the sight of God & men, just so long as they retain their ecclesiastical connexion, their religious communion, ~~and~~ their ministerial interchanges, & their fraternal relations, with those American Churches, which have not distinctly disowned and unequivocally protested against the whole iniquity – Slaveholding, Slavetrading, Return of Fugitives, &c. &c.

– *You* are doing all in *your* power towards that end, that is clear; you & your co-laborers, men and women, have done what you could, that the blood of the slave might not be found on your garments;

I wish we could all feel that we had laboured as steadfastly, as heartily, and as acceptably. You will not fail of your reward. The outraged and suffering slave shall be free and happy yet, and the blessings of thousands, & millions, who were ready to perish shall be yours, in time and in Eternity. — In this strain, I might go on, long. But you know, that we highly & most thankfully prize your labours; and feel ourselves doubly strong, from having such a band of devoted, determined, and thoroughly furnished fellow-workers on your side the sea — and in the very midst of that community, whose opinions and sentiments are so powerful in ours.

I must acknowledge your several letters in a little more business-like fashion. On the 12th June, I recd. a letter from Miss Carpenter, enclosing yours of May 29., with a most acceptable postscript by Miss E., and the resolution of the Lewin's Mead Congn. calling on the B. & F. U. A. [That resn. I had inserted in "Liberator" & "Standard".] — On the 1st day of July, I recd. your daughter's note from London, June 12th & 13th, and a few lines from you, of same dates, giving the agreeable intelligence of the London Meeting. Enclosed came the little handbill of that Meeting (which I have sent to the Standard, as part of a communication), and the Report to Western Unn. Union, with the letter of the Committee signifying their purpose to resign their office at the next Half yearly meeting; (this ~~last~~ Report, I have sent to Mr. Garrison, and he will, I think, make room for a portion of it, though he is exceedingly hard pressed with matter, — for he feels a lively interest in your doings. Whether he will spare R. L. C. or not, for the sake of those who would feel the castigation more than he, I know not; but he knows that R. L. C. deserves one)

And on the 10th July — 3 days since — I received yours from London of June 27., giving me additional particulars of the meeting, and also information about Wm. & Ellen Craft, which I was glad to get; for it w more particular & full than anything I have heard from them, since I parted with them at Portland; & was deeply interesting. I earnestly hope th William will be "steady" now, as our phrase is, and apply himself to these opportunities of improvement. I cordially respond to your kind admiring words of Ellen C. She is certainly a remarkable woman. I am about sending your letter to Mr. Garrison, for he should have the knowledge of the C.s, W.W.B., &c., and I want him to see what you say about Scoble, & Mr. Grant;— if, indeed, S. is the author of such calumnies about W.L.G. as those you refer to, what a scoundrel he is! The letter for Anne Weston (enclosed in your last) I sent to her at once. She is now at Staten Island, in New York harbour, with her ~~[illegible]~~ two sisters, watching with their eldest brother, whose life has been despaired of fo the last fortnight — altho' the last accounts I heard were slightly more favorable. He is a brother very dear to them — a very intelligent and prosperous Merchant in New York — and whose continued life, to all human apprehension, is extremely important to them all. Mr. Chapman's son, I understand, was just about entering mercantile life in connexion with hi and the loss to him will be ~~almost~~ quite irreparable.

The Inquirers of the 7th & 14th came duly to hand — not, as you feared they would, together, but 5 or 6 days apart; and were eagerly perused. I cannot speak, now, of their content, ~~with~~ in detail, save to thank you for your letter there, and to express my admiration for Mr. Armstrong's criticism on R. L. Carpenter's lette it was finely done and well merits our united thanks. I hope R. L. C. will see, at length, that (however unintended) he is standing with the apologists of slaveholding & with the bitterest & most relentless foes of Emancipation — & will withdraw from such a dishonorable alliance.

Ms. B.1.6 v.14 p.38

How different the tone of his brother Philip's remarks, in that Extract from the lecture on Popery which your daughter (I believe it is to her kindness I owe it) sent to me. I was exceedingly glad to see it. It was clear - nothing "uncertain" about that "sound" - it was strong & eloquent; and the results of his position are seen in the action of the Warrington Congregation. How much depends upon the course pursued by the individual to whom a community looks ~~up~~ as their religious teacher! Witness the case of Dr. Gannett - you may not have noticed (in the sketch of debates at the late May Anniversaries at Boston) an allusion to the fact - the truth of which rests on ~~strong~~ good foundation - that Dr. G. has distinctly said, that if a fugitive slave should beg help at his door, - & he knew him to be such, - he would ~~turn~~ send him from his door, unaided (or words to that effect.) So much for the respect due to the Law of the Land! Now I have some relatives - well-educated, & passing for pretty sensible people - who are members of Dr. Gannett's Society. One of them (who in this case can speak for the rest) ~~says~~, when asked if she approved of Mr. Gannett's position, said, "This is a very difficult question - I can't say what I should myself do - I think as my minister thinks". Now there are thousands, & tens of thousands, in Boston, of whom we might naturally expect better things, who are in just this lamentable mental & moral plight. And it seems to roll a most fearful weight of responsibility on the minister's shoulders - or rather soul. - {Dr. G. did not say this in a public discourse, but in a general conversation heard, I understood, by several*

*and among them by Mr. Frederick Frothingham (whom you saw a year or more ago), who testifies to the point - tho' long a friend & admirer of Dr. G.'s

Let me tell you what I did with that extract of P. P. Carpenter's lecture. It seemed to me that, coming from a clerical brother, and as bearing the name of Carpenter, it ought to appear in one of the Unitarian papers. I knew the 'Register' wouldn't touch it; but I thought the "Christian Inquirer" (N.Y.) would. So I sent it to Rev. H. W. Bellows (who is still ~~a corresponding~~ one of the Editors), with a respectful Note, suggesting the propriety of its insertion in the Inq.r After some weeks intermission, I have rec.d it again, with a Note from Mr B., in which he says "I have just returned to the city, & rec.d your communication. It found its way to the editorial desk, & was rejected by Mr. Osgood, who has exclusive control of the Inquirer". [Now Mr. O. had no right to open that letter, unless Mr B. has authorized him to open his private letters.?. I directed it to Rev. H.W.B. - at the C. Inq. office, N.Y. - Possibly he might not have noticed ~~however~~, that the language implied a private note.] Mr. Bellows proceeds to say that he tries to give a somewhat antislavery tone to the Inquirer - that very good & conscientious men may hold what seems to us "very inhuman opinions" [and do very inhuman deeds?, I would ask!] - that he holds himself, in his opposition to the Fugitive Law, "no more honest, courageous, or Christian than some other ministers & men who support it"-; &, in conclusion, that if the Inq. were under his control he should "publish Mr Carpenter's article, with some remarks corrective of its tone" - which, he had before said, ~~he~~ "seemed to him extravagant & uncharitable". So much for H. W. Bellows - I fear I must say, blowing hot & cold - striving, as a plain-spoken man recently said of an Orthodox minister in this County, "so to serve God, as not to offend the Devil". Bellows is allied, by marriage, with wealthy & aristocratic New York families, and is doubtless loth to come to a rupture with them, his society, &c. The wonder is that he does as well as he does.

As his note is a private one, I should wish only a private use made of what I have quoted. – I have now sent the extract to the "Standard", which of course will publish it. – But such is the liberality of our American Unitarian journals (so free, & fearless, and truth-seeking, as they once pretended to be!), towards even their own brethren and associates in the faith! But money and party carry the day against GOD and Humanity; a proposition which is now demonstrated, in the most palpable & glaring way, every day, in every part of the country. The shameless, godless, creatures do not hesitate nor blush to say, in conversation and in public prints, – our business-dealings with the South depend upon our compliance with their requirements – and we cannot give up our business. So they part with their souls for Southern trade – perhaps not a very uneven [illegible] bargain, for their souls must be very small, and very mean. – It must be our duty to present a steady, constant, unbroken front of protest and warfare (with the weapons which are not carnal, but spiritual) against this state of things, never giving place, by subjection, no, not for an hour, – nor showing any deference to the wretched sophistry which would convince us, forsooth, that we ought to obey Man rather than GOD – or, that obeying man (and especially ~~in~~ obeying the compromises with the Slaveholder) is obeying GOD. – It seems rather discouraging to one's ideas of human progress & improvement, to be compelled to be now fighting this battle, which apostles & martyrs have fought so nobly, convincingly & successfully, over & over again – and for such a cause, too! to vindicate GOD & Duty against the claims of an Enactment which ~~would~~ puts to shame any law even of the Dark Ages. [illegible] – But I spare you.

– Did not that letter of S. Bache's – playing second fiddle to R. L. C. – seem to you ill-tempered? Something about it was very revolting to me.

The Christian Register of June 28. made a very gross personal attac
upon me, for my exposure of ~~their~~ its cowardice in ~~stat~~ suppressing John Park
man's article on the Sims case. After ~~char~~ charging me with saying
what was ~~true~~ untrue (to do which they had to assume as mine a statement which I
had publicly pronounced erroneous, and which they had seen, thus themselves
being guilty of suppressio veri, which is nothing better than positive untruth,
Such a case, it seems to me), they say if I were a hundredth part as earnes
to know the truth, as I am to injure the character & malign the reputation
my brethren, I should have done differently. &c. Is not this pretty well, for
men who cannot tolerate the Abolitionists for their harshness of speech, and
assumption of bad motives in others, &c. &c.? I have written an article in
defence of myself against these charges, which I have sent to the Register, and asked them to publish, as an act of justice,
I am told they will not publish it. We shall see. If they will not, I shall
it before Boston readers in some other way. And I wish it might appear
the (London) Inquirer; for Mr. Lalor has alluded to the matter, as you may
remember — and though he does not call my veracity in question, he is u
willing to credit the statement, & thinks I may have been misinformed.
my informant was Rev. John Parkman, author of the obnoxious article, and kn
to all the facts of the case; and I took pains to verify them all, by inquiry, and
by possessing myself of copies of the "two-faced Register" of April 19. 1851.
Register never made any allusion to the affair, until ~~the~~ London Inquirer's
comment forced them to speak, and extorted from them the paragraph, which a
the way through seems to say, A curse on that Samuel May, who makes us all
this trouble! Dr. Parkman publicly told me, 4 or 5 years ago, that "I was born t
be the plague of the Am.n Unit.n Association"!! If they would be true, hones
and would fear God rather than men, neither men nor devils could "plague" the
'Tis their own time-serving & guilty course which renders them so vulnerable, e
at the hands of one whose only weapon of offence is a small stone from the br
of plain truth — an unvarnished tale of simple facts. Their chief enemy, in th
estimation, is he who tells them the truth! —— You see, too, I have had a litt
controversy with F. Douglass (alas for me — such a man of peace as I once had the reputati
Douglass has grieved & offended his oldest — I think his best — friends. His paper is changed — he is ch
and by no means for the better, m

# and among them by Mr. Frederick Frothingham (whom you saw a year or more ago), who testifies to the point — tho' long a friend & admirer of Dr. G's

MS.B.1.6 v.14, p.38